

Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 1, the balanced budget constitutional amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1995

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CONYERS Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to do so, let me just take this opportunity to clarify the schedule for the remainder of the evening and for tomorrow.

Can we confirm that the only remaining legislative business for today is to complete general debate, not going into the Barton amendment?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I believe that is correct. I have not been instructed otherwise, so it is correct.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman indicate to us whether we plan to finish the balanced budget amendment tomorrow or carry some of the bill over until Friday?

Mr. HYDE. I hope with the superb cooperation I have come to expect from the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, we could finish it tomorrow.

Mr. CONYERS. Then, finally, on behalf of the Democratic leadership, I have been asked to confirm that the Democratic side will be assured of at least 20 1-minute speeches tomorrow morning preceding our activity.

Mr. HYDE. At most, the gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 44 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 1.

□ 1749

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

□ 1750

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] had 52 minutes remaining in the debate, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] had 47 minutes remaining in the debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, when the Chair or the Speaker grants unanimous consent that someone may revise and extend their remarks, does that mean, is that implicit that that means within the rules, or does that actually mean that the remarks themselves can be revised in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. It means revisions and extensions within the meaning of clause 9 of rule XIV.

Mr. HOKE. That have been adopted by this House in the 104th Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to another distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many efforts made in this Chamber to try and balance the budget. I can well remember the Freeze Budget, the 1992 Group Budget, the Pork Busters, our good friend Tim Penny who led many bipartisan efforts, and I can remember Gramm-Rudman. Every one of these was to no avail.

Remember this button: "108 in '88?" That meant under Gramm-Rudman our deficit was going to be by law no greater than \$108 billion in 1988.

Well, guess what? It was \$187 billion, not \$108 billion.

Promises, promises, promises, promises, and every one of them was broken.

It is time to keep our promise. The deficit today is over \$200 billion, and it is as far as the eye can see \$200 billion. In fact, by the turn of the century it is not going to be \$200 billion, it is not going to be \$300 billion. The OMB, the Office of Management and Budget is projecting over \$400 billion.

I had a town meeting a couple of weeks ago and I had a very activist Democrat stand up and say:

Fred, I have been against the balanced budget before because I did not think it would work. I thought we had laws that made it work, but I've given up. When you get back to Washington, please, please, please, for our children and for our jobs, pass a balanced budget amendment.

It is time now to keep our promises. It is time to pass a balanced budget amendment, a constitutional one.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

(Mr. BROWDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me first commend my colleague, CHARLIE STENHOLM, for his leadership on the issue we are debating today. We are considering, hopefully for the last time, passage of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I have been on this floor three times before pressing the Members of this institution to let this debate out of Washington. Ratification is my ultimate goal, but more important in my mind is the great public debate that will take place around this country during the process of ratification.

The balanced budget debate must be expanded beyond the Washington betway and with passage in Congress the debate will begin in earnest. For as the states consider ratification, our country will begin a full and frank public debate on the role of government—Federal, State and local—and the cost of fulfilling that role.

If the politicians who designed past efforts to bring the budget into balance had engaged the public in that process then I doubt we would have dug—or been allowed to dig—such a huge deficit hole.

Mr. Chairman, the balanced budget amendment incorporates into our fundamental law the principle that the Federal Government cannot spend more money than it takes in, except under special circumstances. That principle rightly fits in the Constitution and would not, as some suggest, trivialize that basic document. But more importantly, the ratification process will allow, even force, the American people to focus on what they want from their government, what benefits they will surrender in the name of fiscal responsibility, and what burdens they will shoulder to do the important tasks they ask their government to do.